Remarks

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed July 13, 2007. A Petition for Extension of Time is submitted herewith, together with the appropriate fee.

I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections

Prior to the Office Action mailed July 13, 2007, Claims 1-57 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, Claim 56 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory matter. Claims 1-57 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Tupper (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0073475 A1).

II. Summary of Applicants' Amendments

The present Response amends Claims 1, 3, 8-11, 14-16, 22-25, 28-31, 33, 35-37, 40-41, 43, 48-51, 54-55, and 57, and cancels Claim 56, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1-55 and 57. Reconsideration of the Application, as amended, is respectfully requested. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to prosecute any originally presented or canceled claims in a continuing or future application.

III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101

In the Office Action mailed July 13, 2007, Claim 56 was rejected as being directed to non-statutory matter. Accordingly, Claim 56 has been canceled. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

IV. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

In the Office Action mailed July 13, 2007, Claims 1-57 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Tupper (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0073475 A1).

Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended by the present Response to more clearly define the embodiment therein. As amended, Claim 1 defines:

> *1. (Currently Amended) A method for providing a request to a portlet wherein the portlet renders itself in a graphical user interface (GUI), comprising:*

mapping the request to a control tree wherein the control tree is a logical representation of the GUI and wherein the control tree includes a set of controls representing graphical and functional elements of the GUI which are related hierarchically to one another;

advancing the control tree through at least one life cycle stage based on the request, wherein the control tree includes a portlet control that represents the portlet; and

providing the request to a portlet container, wherein the providing is performed by the portlet control.

Claim 1, as amended, discloses a method for providing a request to a portlet wherein the portlet renders itself in a GUI, comprising mapping the request to a control tree wherein the control tree is a logical representation of the GUI and wherein the control tree includes a set of controls representing graphical and functional elements of the GUI which are hierarchically related to one another, advancing the control tree through at least one life cycle stage based on the request, wherein the control tree includes a portlet control that represents the portlet, and providing the request to a portlet container, wherein the providing is performed by the portlet control. Applicants respectfully submit that these features are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references.

Tupper discloses a system and method that reduces the cycle development time for parametric models (regression formulas) (paragraph [0011]). In one form a system for enabling optimization of a parametric modeling process is provided that includes a regression analysis tree program used to build a tree based on user input (paragraph [0012]). After the tree is built, the regression analysis tree program performs regression analysis to calculate at least one regression result for an attribute subset in a tree branch (paragraph [0012]).

It appears from the above description that, in Tupper, a tree is built solely for regression analysis. However, it is respectfully submitted that Tupper does not appear to disclose *mapping the request to a control tree* ***wherein the control tree is a logical representation of the GUI*** *and wherein the control tree includes a set of controls representing graphical and functional elements of the GUI which are related hierarchically to one another* because the tree built in Tupper does not appear to relate at all to being a representation of the graphical user interface in any way. While the Office Action cites paragraph [0012] of Tupper as disclosing the above claim feature, Paragraph [0012] of Tupper merely describes the building of a tree by a regression analysis tree program to

calculate at least one regression result and thus does not appear to disclose the above claim feature.

Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that Tupper also does not appear to disclose *advancing the control tree through at least one life cycle stage based on the request, wherein the control tree includes a portlet control that represents the portlet*. In the Office Action, paragraphs [0012] and [0032] of Tupper were cited as disclosing the above claim features. However, as discussed above, paragraph [0012] of Tupper merely describes the building of a tree, while paragraph [0032] of Tupper describes a system for building a tree of regression formulas and produces regression results. However, neither paragraphs [0012] nor [0032] appear to mention anything related to ***advanvcing the control tree through at least one life cycle stage based on the request****, wehrein the control tree includes a portlet control that represents the portlet*.

In addition, it is respectfully submitted that Tupper also does not appear to disclose *providing the request to a portlet container, wherein the providing is performed by the portlet control*. In the Office Action, paragraphs [0035] and [0039] of Tupper were cited as disclosing the above claim features. However, paragraph [0035] merely discloses various storage device options of a computer while paragraph [0039] merely discloses that attribute date, which is data pertaining to any wide range of attributes, maybe stored in various formats or storage devices. However, Tupper does not appear to disclose *a portlet container*, or any providing of ***the request*** (which is mapped to a control tree) to the portlet container.

In view of the above comments, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1, as amended, is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in biew of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 16, 41, and 57

Claims 16, 41, and 57 have been similarly amended to more clearly define the respective embodiments therein. For similar reasons as provided above with respect to Claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 16, 41, and 57, as amended, are likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claim 30

Claim 30 has been amended by the present Response to more clearly define the embodiment therein. As amended, Claim 30 defines:

30. (Currently Amended) A system for providing a request to a portlet wherein the portlet renders itself in a graphical user interface (GUI), comprising:

a first container operable to map the request to a control tree factory;

the control tree factory operable to generate a control tree based on the request wherein the control tree includes at least one portlet control, wherein the control tree is a logical representation of the GUI, and wherein the control tree includes a set of controls representing graphical and functional elements of the GUI which are related hierarchically to one another;

a lifecycle driver operable to drive the control tree through at least one life cycle stage;

a portlet container operable to accept the request from the at least one portlet control and provide the request to the portlet.

Claim 30, as amended, defines a system for providing a request to a portlet wherein the portlet renders itself in a GUI, comprising a first container operable to map the request to a control tree factory, the control tree factory operable to generate a control tree based on the request wherein the control tree includes at least one portlet control, wherein the control tree is a logical representation of the GUI, and wherein the control tree includes a set of controls representing graphical and functional elements of the GUI which are related hierarchically to one another, a lifecycle driver operable to drive the control tree through at least one life cycle state, and a portlet container operable to accept the request from the at least one portlet control and provide the request to the portlet. Applicants respectfully submit that these features are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references.

Tupper discloses a system and method that reduces the cycle development time for parametric models (regression formulas) (paragraph [0011]). In one form a system for enabling optimization of a parametric modeling process is provided that includes a regression analysis tree program used to build a tree based on user input (paragraph [0012]). After the tree is built, the regression analysis tree program performs regression analysis to calculate at least one regression result for an attribute subset in a tree branch (paragraph [0012]).

It appears from the above description that, in Tupper, a tree is built solely for regression analysis. However, it is respectfully submitted that Tupper does not appear to disclose, as amended, *the control tree factory operable to generate a control tree based on the request wherein*

the control tree includes at least one portlet control, wherein the control tree is a logical representation of the GUI, and wherein the control tree includes a set of controls representing graphical and functional elements of the GUI which are related hierarchically to one another, because the tree built in Tupper does not appear to relate at all to being a representation of the graphical user interface in any way. While the Office Action cites paragraph [0012] of Tupper as disclosing the above claim feature, Paragraph [0012] of Tupper merely describes the building of a tree by a regression analysis tree program to calculate at least one regression result and thus does not appear to disclose the above claim feature.

Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that Tupper also does not appear to disclose *a lifecycle driver operable to drive the control tree through at least one life cycle stage.* In the Office Action, paragraphs [0012] and [0032] of Tupper were cited as disclosing the above claim features. However, as discussed above, paragraph [0012] of Tupper merely describes the building of a tree, while paragraph [0032] of Tupper describes a system for building a tree of regression formulas and produces regression results. However, neither paragraphs [0012] nor [0032] appear to mention anything related to *a lifecycle driver operable to drive the control tree through at least one* ***life cycle stage***.

In addition, it is respectfully submitted that Tupper also does not appear to disclose *a portlet container operable to accept the request from the at least one portlet control and provide the request to the portlet.* In the Office Action, paragraphs [0035] and [0039] of Tupper were cited as disclosing the above claim features. However, paragraph [0035] merely discloses various storage device options of a computer while paragraph [0039] merely discloses that attribute date, which is data pertaining to any wide range of attributes, maybe stored in various formats or storage devices. However, Tupper does not appear to disclose *a portlet container*, or any providing of ***the request*** (which is mapped to a control tree) by the portlet container to the portlet.

In view of the above comments, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 30, as amended, is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in biew of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-15, 17-29, 31-40, and 42-55

Claims 2-15, 17-29, 31-40, and 42-55 are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the comments provided above. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2-15,

17-29, 31-40, and 42-55 are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

It is also submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

Claims 56

Claim 56 has been canceled by the present Response, rendering moot the rejections of this claim. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to prosecute the canceled claim in a continuing or future application.

V. Conclusion

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

Enclosed is a PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for extending the time to respond up to and including November 13, 2007.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this reply, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 13, 2007

By: /Guanyao Cheng/
Guanyao Cheng
Reg. No. 58,555

Customer No. 23910
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800